

Appl. No.: 10/580,278  
Filed: May 22, 2006  
Amdt. dated 10/12/2010

## REMARKS

Claims 21-25, 27, 29-31, 33, and 35-40 are pending. Claims 1-20, 26, 28, 32, and 34 are canceled. The Office Action rejects Claim 40 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 21-25, 27, 29-31, 33, and 35-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,061,646 to Martino (“Martino”) in view of U.S. Pat. No. 7,130,801 to Kitahara (“Kitahara”).

Applicants have amended several claims as set forth in the above listing of amended claims to more particularly and distinctly claim the invention. These amendments are fully supported by the originally filed specification. New independent Claims 41-42 have been added and are fully supported by the originally filed specification. In light of the amendments and subsequent remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance.

### Applicants’ Attempt to Interview the Examiner

Applicants note that Applicants’ undersigned representative attempted to contact the Examiner to conduct an interview regarding the rejections on October 5, 2010. However, the Examiner did not return the phone call in advance of the filing of the instant response. As such, Applicants respectfully request that should the Examiner have questions about the remarks presented herein and/or not find the remarks to be convincing that the Examiner contact the Applicants’ undersigned representative prior to issuing an Office Action.

### The Rejection of Claim 40 under § 101 is Overcome

The Office Action alleges that Claim 40 is directed to non-statutory subject matter because the computer-readable storage medium may be interpreted as a “nonstatutory signal or carrier wave.” Applicants respectfully disagree with the position of the Office, because a transient signal or wave is merely a transient carrier and cannot *store* computer-readable program instructions as the computer-readable *storage* medium is recited to in Claim 40. Nevertheless, in spite of the clear error by the Office in rejecting Claim 40 under § 101, Applicants have amended

Claim 40 to clarify that the computer-readable storage medium is *non-transitory*. This amendment is fully supported by the originally filed specification. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claim 40 under § 101 is overcome.

The Rejection of Independent Claims 38-40 under § 103(a) is Overcome

Independent Claim 38 is directed to an apparatus comprising at least one processor and at least one memory storing computer program code. The at least one memory and stored computer program code are configured, with the at least one processor, to cause the apparatus to at least determine a language selected for a first user interface. The at least one memory and stored computer program code are configured, with the at least one processor, to further cause the apparatus to determine, based at least in part on the language selected for the first user interface, one or more language packages associated with the language selected for the first user interface. The one or more language packages are determined from among a plurality of available language packages. Each of the plurality of language packages is associated with a plurality of languages. At least some of the plurality of languages are associated with more than one of the plurality of language packages. The at least one memory and stored computer program code are configured, with the at least one processor, to additionally cause the apparatus, in an instance in which only one language package is determined to be associated with the language selected for the first user interface, to select the determined language package for use by a speech recognition system. The at least one memory and stored computer program code are configured, with the at least one processor, to also cause the apparatus, in an instance in which multiple language packages are determined to be associated with the language selected for the first user interface, to determine a language selected for a second user interface and select one of the determined language packages based on the language selected for the first user interface and the language selected for the second user interface for use by the speech recognition system. Independent Claims 39 and 40 are directed to a method and computer program product, respectively, and though each has its own respective scope, recite substantially similar features insofar as this discussion is concerned.

The Office Action alleges that the independent claims (Claims 38-40) are unpatentable over the combination of Martino and Kitahara. However, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. In this regard, it is clear that Martino and Kitahara fail to teach or suggest each feature recited in the independent claims. Indeed, Martino even teaches away from the independent claims.

Martino teaches that a language recognition dictionary (LRD) has enough words to provide recognition for 40 percent of each language. A device accepts an utterance as an input and the input is passed to each speech engine using the LRD to create a text unit from the utterance for each language represented in the LRD. A language recognizer then counts the number of recognized words for each text unit and sums them to determine the language with the greatest summed hits. A single-language speech recognition dictionary (SRD) is then loaded for the language having the greatest summed hits. *See*, col. 9, line 54 – Col. 10, line 67 of Martino.

Accordingly, Martino teaches using a multi-language dictionary having 40 percent of the words in each language of the multi-language dictionary to recognize a language of an utterance and then load a single language dictionary for the recognized language. In this regard, Martino does not teach or suggest determining a selected language (e.g., a single language) for a first user interface and, based on the selected language, determining one or more language *packages*, each having a *plurality* of languages associated therewith, as featured in the independent claims. In fact, Martino, at best, teaches the opposite of the claimed feature, as Martino uses a multi-language dictionary to identify a language and load a *single* language dictionary for the dictionary, not a *language package*, as recited in the independent claims.

Martino further fails to teach or suggest the recited feature of “at least some of said plurality of languages are associated with more than one of said plurality of language packages.” The section of Martino cited by the Examiner merely discloses language groups for the Romance and Germanic languages, the ideographic languages, and the Slavic languages. There is no teaching or suggestion that a language from one of the groups is included in another of the groups. Indeed, it is quite clear that a language could not be in more than one of the groups taught by Martino, as, for example, a Romance language is clearly not a Slavic or ideographic

language. Moreover, neither Kitahara nor any other cited reference, taken alone or in combination with Martino cures the clear deficiencies of Martino.

Applicants further submit that it is clearly improper for the Office to combine any reference with Martino for the proposition that the combination teaches the features of:

in an instance in which multiple language packages are determined to be associated with the language selected for the first user interface;  
determining a language selected for a second user interface; and  
selecting, by the processor, one of the determined language packages based on the language selected for the first user interface and the language selected for the second user interface for use by the speech recognition system,

as recited in the independent claims. In this regard, as previously discussed, Martino clearly teaches identifying a single language, that is the language having the greatest summed number of hits for an input utterance. As such, in *no instance* would Martino result in a determination of *multiple* language packages to be associated with a selected language. Further, modifying Martino as such would render Martino inoperable for its intended purpose. Accordingly, the combination of Kitahara and Martino is improper.

Further, even assuming *in arguendo* that the combination of Martino and Kitahara were proper, Kitahara fails to teach or suggest that which the Office alleges and thus fails to cure the admitted deficiencies of Martino. In this regard, Kitahara likewise fails to teach or suggest the feature of selecting a language package based on the language selected for the first user interface *and* the language selected for the second user interface in an instance in which *multiple* language packages are determined to be associated with the language selected for the first user interface, as recited by the independent claims. Further, even when considering the combined disclosures of Martino and Kitahara, the combination likewise fails to teach or suggest this feature. Indeed, as previously discussed, Martino clearly teaches away from this feature.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the independent claims are clearly patentably distinct from Martino and Kitahara, taken alone or in combination. Accordingly, the rejection set forth in the Office Action is in clear error and the rejection is overcome. Moreover, none of the other cited references, taken alone or in combination, cure the deficiencies of Martino and Kitahara. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that the

Appl. No.: 10/580,278  
Filed: May 22, 2006  
Amdt. dated 10/12/2010

independent claims are patentably distinct from the cited references, taken alone or in combination, and are in condition for allowance.

The Rejection of the Dependent Claims is Overcome

Because each of the dependent claims includes each of the recitations of a respective independent base claim, Applicants further submit that the dependent claims are patentably distinguishable from the cited references, taken alone or in combination, for at least those reasons discussed above. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that the rejections of the dependent claims are overcome and the dependent claims are in condition for allowance.

Appl. No.: 10/580,278  
Filed: May 22, 2006  
Amdt. dated 10/12/2010

## CONCLUSION

In view of the amended claims and remarks presented above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the present claims of the present application are in condition for immediate allowance. It is therefore respectfully requested that a Notice of Allowance be issued. The Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney to resolve any remaining issues in order to expedite examination of the present application.

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 CFR § 1.136(a), and any fee required therefore (including fees for net addition of claims) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 16-0605.

Respectfully submitted,



Charles A. Leyes  
Registration No. 61,317

**Customer No. 00826**  
**ALSTON & BIRD LLP**  
Bank of America Plaza  
101 South Tryon Street, Suite 4000  
Charlotte, NC 28280-4000  
Tel Charlotte Office (704) 444-1000  
Fax Charlotte Office (704) 444-1111

ELECTRONICALLY FILED USING THE EFS-WEB ELECTRONIC FILING SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE ON October 12, 2010.